DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 837 JC 740 293

TITLE	Assessment of Junior College Program for Youthful Offenders in an Institution.
INSTITUTION	California State Dept. of the Youth Authority, Sacramento.
REPORT NO	RR-65
PUB DATE	Jun 73
NOTE	43p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; *Correctional Education; Followup Studies; *Junior Colleges; Personality Tests; Post Secondary Education; Program Evaluation; Rehabilitation Programs; *Student Characteristics; Student Reaction; Technical Reports; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	California; *Columbia Junior College; Fricot Ranch School

ABSTRACT

The Columbia Junior College Program was started at the Youth Authority's Fricot Ranch School in May 1969, and ended with the institution's closing two years later. The program provided wards of the institution with an introduction to college, first at Fricot and later at day classes at the college campus. The major elements of the program were: (1) remedial, developmental, and introductory college courses; (2) rehabilitative services involving counseling; and (3) organized recreational activities. The median age of the students was 19.1 years, with 97 percent being 17-21. Of the 127 students in the program, 73 percent remained until paroled and 34 percent dropped out. Those who remained in the program completed an average of 2.7 quarters during their average stay of 8.8 months. They accumulated an average of 39 units of college credits, and their median grade-point average was 3.3, with 46 percent attaining 3.0 or higher. Personality tests, administered on a pre-post basis, showed that gains greater than would be expected by chance were made on Self-Acceptance, Self-Esteem, and Personal Competence Scales. The students' reactions to the program, as elicited by questionnaire, were largely in the "very favorable" category. Follow-up data revealed that 60 percent of the students continued college during their first six-months after parole; nearly two-thirds attended college four months or longer. About 90 percent were involved with jobs and/or school during this period. The findings suggest that the program had a rehabilitative influence and was conducive to academic achievement. (DB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 094837

Assessment of Junior College Program for Youthful Offenders in an Institution

Research Report No. 65

june, 1973

JC 740 293

CALIFORNIA
YOUTH AUTHORITY

State of California

RONALD REAGAN
Governor

Health and Welfare Agency

EARL W. BRIAN, M.D.
Secretary

Department of the Youth Authority

KEITH S. GRIFFITHS
Chief of Research and Development

JOACHIM P. SECKEL
Senior Social Research Analyst

BETTY J. RAAB
Statistical Clerk (Formerly)

ALLEN F. BREED,
DIRECTOR

GEORGE R. ROBERTS,
CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR

YOUTH AUTHORITY BOARD

ALLEN F. BREED,
DIRECTOR AND CHAIRMAN

JULIO GONZALES,
VICE CHAIRMAN

ED BOWE
RICHARD W. CALVIN, JR.
RUDOLPH A. CASTRO
WILLIAM L. RICHEY
GLADYS L. SANDERSON

HIGHLIGHTS

The Fricot-Columbia Junior College Program was initiated in May of 1969 and continued until the closing of the Youth Authority's Fricot Ranch School about two years later. The program was aimed at providing wards assigned to the institution with an introduction to college by enrolling them in courses at Fricot and, later on, enabling them to attend daytime classes on the college campus. The major elements of the program consisted of: 1) remedial, developmental, and introductory college courses; 2) rehabilitative services involving individual, small group, and large group counseling, and 3) organized recreational activities made available for interested students.

The median age of students admitted into the program was 19.1, with 97 percent ranging from 17 to 21. Their ethnic backgrounds were 76 percent Caucasian, 13 percent Black, 9 percent Mexican-American, and 2 percent of other extraction. Nearly 95 percent were first commitments to the Youth Authority, with 76 percent adjudicated by Criminal Court and 24 percent by Juvenile Court. Slightly over half of the wards were committed from counties in Southern California.

Of the 127 students admitted, 93 (73 percent) remained in the program until paroled, while 34 (27 percent) dropped out. A significantly greater proportion of the program graduates compared to the dropouts were first admissions to the Youth Authority, and without records of prior incarceration at the local community level.

The students who remained in the program until paroled completed an average (median) of 2.7 quarters during their average stay of 8.8 months. They

accumulated an average (median) of 39 units of college credits; this represents 15 units more than would be expected based on the full-load schedule of 12 units per semester normally prescribed in a junior college. Their median grade-point average was 3.3, or the equivalent of a "B", with 46 percent attaining 3.0 or higher.

In terms of background characteristics, students who completed more college quarters, earned more college credits, and obtained a higher grade-point average were likely to be: 1) without records of local detention prior to Youth Authority commitment; 2) first admissions rather than readmissions to the Youth Authority; 3) White rather than non-White (though this was consistent only for first admissions); and 4) committed for offenses against persons rather than for offenses involving property. Although suggestive, these findings were generally not statistically significant.

To assess changes in attitudes and socio-psychological factors, personality tests were administered on a pre-post basis to a segment of the study population. The pre-post mean score changes were in a favorable direction on each of the eight scales used. Gains greater than would be expected by chance were found on the Self-Acceptance, Self-Esteem, and Personal Competence scales.

To explore students' reactions to the program, an opinion questionnaire was administered shortly before their release to parole. Responses to items concerning appraisal of the program fall largely into the "very favorable" category. The item including the highest proportion (98 percent) of "very favorable" responses pertained to the degree to which the program had influenced students to continue college. The program area rated most favorably

centered on social aspects, such as furloughs, visits, and recreational activities; the area rated least favorably dealt with work assignments.

Follow-up data reveal that 60 percent of the students paroled from the program continued college during their first six months of time out. Nearly two thirds attended college four months or longer during their initial six months on parole. Approximately 90 percent of the wards were involved with jobs and/or school during this period.

The rate of parole violation after 15 months of post-release time was about nine percent. This may be compared against the statewide rate of 28 percent for wards 18-20 years old who were paroled during 1970.

It was concluded that the program as implemented was a viable approach which provided authentic college experiences for a substantial number of wards. The findings suggest that the program had a rehabilitative influence and was conducive to academic achievement. One of the recommendations made is that similar future programs be supplemented with a post-release phase including a halfway house or residential center. In this way, students would receive sufficient structure and guidance to continue on with college.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
HIGHLIGHTS	i
INTRODUCTION	1
PROGRAM EVALUATION	6
Population Characteristics	6
Population Movement Statistics	8
Academic Performance	10
Pre-Post Attitudinal Measures	12
Student Views Regarding Program	15
Post-Release Performance	17
CONCLUSIONS	23
APPENDIX A - TABLE A-1	26
TABLE A-2	27
APPENDIX B - CJC QUESTIONNAIRE	28

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		
1	BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF WARDS ADMITTED INTO FRICOT-COLUMBIA JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAM	7
2	POPULATION STATISTICS FOR FRICOT-COLUMBIA JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAM, MAY 1969 THROUGH JUNE 1971	8
3	ACADEMIC PERFORMANCES OF STUDENTS PAROLED FROM FRICOT-COLUMBIA JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAM	11
4	PRE- AND POST-TEST MEAN SCORES ON SELECTED SCALES FOR SAMPLE OF PROJECT STUDENTS	13
5	POST-TEST SAMPLE OF PROJECT STUDENTS COMPARED TO NORMATIVE GROUPS ON MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF CALIFORNIA PERSONALITY INVENTORY	14
6	SELECTED STUDENT RESPONSES TO PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE	16

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE		Page No.
7	COLLEGE AND OTHER SCHOOL ATTENDANCE OF PROGRAM GRADUATES DURING FIRST SIX MONTHS AND SEVEN TO TWELVE MONTHS OF POST-RELEASE TIME	18
8	PERIOD OF COLLEGE OR OTHER SCHOOL ATTENDANCE DURING FIRST SIX MONTHS AND SEVEN TO TWELVE MONTHS OF POST-RELEASE TIME	19
9	EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF PROGRAM GRADUATES DURING FIRST SIX MONTHS AND SEVEN TO TWELVE MONTHS OF POST-RELEASE TIME	20
10	PERIOD OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT DURING FIRST SIX MONTHS AND SEVEN TO TWELVE MONTHS OF POST-RELEASE TIME	20
11	SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND JOB STATUS DURING FIRST SIX MONTHS AND SEVEN TO TWELVE MONTHS OF POST-RELEASE TIME	21
12	PAROLE VIOLATION STATUS OF PROGRAM GRADUATES, BY POST-RELEASE PERIOD	22

LIST OF TABLES

(Appendix)

A-1	SELECTED BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF GRADUATES, TRANSFERS, AND ESCAPES AMONG WARDS ADMITTED INTO FRICOT-COLUMBIA JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAM	26
A-2	ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF WARDS WHO COMPLETED FRICOT-COLUMBIA JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAM	27

INTRODUCTION

The Columbia Junior College Program was started at the Youth Authority's Fricot Ranch School in May of 1969 and was terminated two years later with the closing of the institution. It represented a comprehensive counseling-work-study program that furnished remedial and introductory college courses in conjunction with rehabilitative services for a selected group of older wards. In addition, it enabled students to attend college in the community during the day and then return to the institution. Subsequent to the program's termination, similar models were adopted at two Youth Authority institutions. Presented below is a description of the program, the results obtained in its evaluation, and concluding statements regarding its efficacy and impact.

NATURE OF PROGRAM

The chief goals of the Columbia Junior College Program were as follows:

1. To enable older wards with academic ability to enter college and take appropriate first-year courses during their stay at a Youth Authority institution;

2. To encourage these students to continue their college careers after release to parole;

3. To promote non-delinquent behaviors and attitudes among the students, conducive to their positive adjustment in the community;

4. To decrease support service costs at Fricot by using older wards in selected support service capacities; and

5. To enhance the institution's treatment program for younger wards through the use of older male wards as staff aides.

The program was a joint endeavor between the faculties of the Columbia Junior College and the Fricot Ranch School. The college is located 40 miles, or

about one hour's driving time, from Fricot. The start of the program marked the first time that a large group of older wards (median age 19.1) was assigned to Fricot, which until then had generally housed the Youth Authority's youngest population of wards (median age = 12.0). A fifty-bed living unit was set aside for the older student wards as they were admitted into the program over a period of several months. The median stay of the 97 students who entered and completed the program was 8.8 months.

The selection of wards eligible for the program was guided by a set of criteria. Stated briefly, these were: a) minimum age 18; b) high school diploma or senior class status at last high school attended; c) achievement test and/or I.Q. scores suggest potential for college education; d) sufficient social-emotional maturity to remain in open setting of the Fricot Ranch School; e) expected length of stay following arrival at Fricot of at least 7 months; and f) offense history excludes sex offenses, arson, homicide or aggressive assault, recent or extensive escapes, and addiction to narcotics or dangerous drugs.

As detailed later in this report, eligible wards were identified by staff at Youth Authority reception centers and institutions, and the Department of Corrections Reception Guidance Center at Deuel Vocational Institution. Those who expressed interest in and wanted to be considered for the college program were then referred to a Fricot Screening Committee. During its first eight months, the committee consisted mainly of non-program staff: the Assistant Superintendent of Fricot, the Supervisor of Academic Instruction, Supervisor of Treatment, Supervising Social Worker, and the Treatment Team Supervisor involved in the Fricot-Columbia Junior College Program. For the remaining period, the committee was made up of staff in the program; namely, its

Treatment Team Supervisor, Senior Youth Counselor, and the Caseworker. Candidates who met the eligibility criteria and who agreed to abide by the rules and expectations of the work-study program were generally accepted by the committee and recommended to the Youth Authority Board for assignment to the program. Upon reviewing the eligibility and willingness of candidates to enter the program, the Board then assigned them accordingly.[1]

While precise figures were not available for the evaluation, it is estimated that 75 percent of the referrals were both accepted by the Screening Committee and assigned to the program by the Board. A total of 127 wards were admitted into the program during its 25-month duration.

After admission into the program, the students participated in a schedule of work and academic activities and were provided a variety of counseling services. The academic component was implemented in three phases. The first of these offered 11 units of remedial and developmental courses by Fricot instructors. The second phase offered 10 units of transferable college courses taught by the college instructors on the Fricot campus. The third phase included attendance at the community college campus and provided 15-17 units per quarter. Not all students were limited to the first phase before moving into phase 2; some were able to take the remedial or developmental pre-college courses together with transferable college work.

In volunteering for assignment to the program, students agreed to work about 20 hours per week within the institution in addition to carrying out their

---

[1]The Board did not set any special conditions for the assignment of candidates to the program other than those indicated above.

college studies.[2] The work component of the program was aimed at providing a job-related experience by utilizing students in selected supportive services. The latter included culinary work which had previously been performed by nine food service assistants hired from the outside community. In the judgement of several Fricot staff and administrators, the students generally maintained a level of service similar to that provided previously. It is estimated that about $61,000 of savings were realized through use of the students on the culinary work assignments. Some of the students also assisted Fricot tradesmen with tasks in grounds maintenance and in the Fricot laundry. The aforementioned work assignments did not involve remuneration, although it was assumed that students received some compensation from the program's payment of tuition, books, and other fees. Approximately one-fourth of the students spent all or a portion of their work schedule as staff aides helping younger wards in school and living unit activities. The wards were selected as staff aides on the basis of manifest interest and ability to assist youngsters at Fricot. They were assigned to both living units and classrooms, encompassing three units and 15 classrooms involving a total of 120 younger wards. Averaging 15 hours per month, the staff aides were paid at a rate of 50¢ per hour. This aspect of the program was federally funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The treatment component consisted of a combination of counseling and casework services to deal with problems encountered by the students within the program and to move them toward a non-delinquent life style. The treatment included

---

[2]Coordinating the work-study schedule of students posed many complications and necessitated some flexibility in rearranging work assignments and classes. The Treatment Team Supervisor had to expend much effort resolving this problem.

monthly small group counseling utilizing transactional analysis, weekly large group meetings to enhance ward and staff communication regarding day-to-day problems, and weekly individual counseling to focus on personal and confidential concerns among the young men in the program.

Periodic case conferences were held to set treatment goals and to evaluate the progress of individual students. Here again, transactional analysis was used, which allowed each student to be involved in his goal setting and progress evaluation.

An added feature of the treatment component was a preventive drug therapy program, which was initiated during the last three months of the project. This effort entailed periodic sessions at Fricot between the students and ex-drug users affiliated with the Sonora Insight House, a drug therapy program in the community.

To facilitate staff planning, coordination, and review of program activities, treatment team meetings were held once or twice a month. Two students were nominated to participate in these meetings, although they were excluded from these meetings deemed to be of a confidential nature.

To round out the above program components, a variety of recreational activities were made available to the students. Included were various athletic events, arts and crafts hobbies, library usage, television watching, and a series of co-ed dances.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Set forth below are the essential findings obtained in the program evaluation. Of major interest are the following areas: a) characteristics of the study population, b) program movement statistics, c) academic performance, d) pre- to post-attitudinal changes, e) student opinions regarding program impact, and f) follow-up information concerning parole outcome and school attendance.

Population Characteristics

Considering the 127 students who were admitted into the program, their major personal and social legal characteristics were as follows. As shown in Table 1, the wards accepted into the program had a median age of 19.1, with 97 percent ranging from 17 to 21. Their ethnic background consisted of 76 percent White, 13 percent Black, 9 percent Mexican-American, and the remaining 2 percent of other extraction. Although 51 percent had been incarcerated at the local level prior to their Youth Authority commitment, nearly 95 percent were first commitments to the Youth Authority. About 76 percent were committed by Criminal Court and 24 percent by Juvenile Court. Approximately 43 percent were committed for involvement with illegal drugs, 32 percent for property offenses, 17 percent for assaultive offenses, and 8 percent for other offenses. Worth noting is the fact that 52 percent of the wards committed came from Southern California, 21 percent from the Bay area, 17 percent from Central Valley Counties, and the remaining 9 percent from other counties. This finding suggests a need to provide corresponding college programs for wards assigned to southern institution. As mentioned earlier, this need has been largely met by a similar college program established in January, 1972,

TABLE 1

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF WARDS ADMITTED INTO
FRICOT-COLUMBIA JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAM

Characteristics	Number	Percent
TOTAL ADMITTED TO PROGRAM	127	100.0
Age at Admission		
16	3	2.4
17	13	10.2
18	25	19.7
19	41	32.2
20	34	26.8
21	10	7.9
22	1	0.8
Median	19.1	
Mean	19.0	
Ethnic Group		
Caucasian	96	75.6
Black	16	12.6
Mexican-American	12	9.4
Other	3	2.4
Prior Incarceration		
None	62	48.8
Prior Incarceration	65	51.2
Institutional Admission Status		
First Admission	95	94.8
Re-Admission	32	25.2
Court		
Juvenile	30	23.6
Criminal	97	76.4

Characteristics	Number	Percent
TOTAL ADMITTED TO PROGRAM	127	100.0
Offense		
Assaultive	21	16.5
Property Offense	41	32.3
Illegal Drugs	55	43.3
Other	10	7.9
County of Commitment		
Los Angeles	41	32.3
Other Southern Calif. Cos.	25	19.7
Central Valley Counties	22	17.3
S. F. Bay Area Counties	27	21.3
Other Counties	12	9.4
Facility Prior to Fricot		
Reception Centers:		
RGC-DVI (Dept. of Corrects.)	80	63.0
NRCC	14	11.0
SRCC	3	2.4
Institutions:		
Preston	13	10.2
Karl Holton	11	8.7
YTS	4	3.1
Paso Robles	1	0.8
Camp:		
Pine Grove	1	0.8

at the Youth Authority's Ventura School.

Table 1 further indicates that 63 percent of the program's wards had been selected from the Reception Guidance Center (DVI-RGC) of the Department of Corrections; 13 percent came from reception centers and 24 percent from institutions and camps in the Youth Authority. The high percentage of admissions from DVI-RGC reflects the fact that during the program's period of operation large proportions of older wards were processed through this reception center.

Population Movement Statistics

As mentioned earlier, about 75 percent of the wards referred as candidates were accepted by the Screening Committee and assigned by the Youth Authority Board to the program. Of the 127 wards admitted over the 25-month period of program operation, 93 (73 percent) remained in the program until release to parole, while 34 (27 percent) dropped out. The latter include 24 transfers to other institutions and 10 escapees (See Table 2).

TABLE 2

POPULATION STATISTICS FOR FRICOT-COLUMBIA JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAM, MAY 1969 THROUGH JUNE 1971

Population Status	Number	Percent
Total Assignees	127	100.0
Attrition	34	26.8
Transfers	(24)	(18.9)
Escapes	(10)	(7.9)
Total Paroled	93	73.2

It is of interest that the transfers were mainly due to disciplinary cases (14), and to a much lesser extent due to academic failures (6) and requests by wards for transfers (4). Also, the greatest number (5) of the escapees ran away from Fricot, whereas relatively few escaped while attending the college (3) or while engaged in other off-campus activities (2). The median time in program was 3.4 months for the escapees and 2.6 months for the transfers; about 70% of both the escapes and transfers occurred during the first four months of program involvement. In comparing the first and the second 12 months of the program, the escape rate (based on the number of wards who entered the program during each of the two periods) declined from 8.8 percent to 6.7 percent. Moreover, the rate of transfers for the two periods decreased from 22.0 percent to 15.2 percent.

It should be pointed out that virtually all of the students who remained in the program were involved in a full-time campus schedule prior to being paroled. According to program administrators, this was accomplished without any apparent jeopardy to the college campus or area residents. As mentioned above, there were a few escapees, but none of these or any other students were arrested or committed offenses in the community while in the program.

Did wards who graduated or were paroled from the program tend to differ from those who dropped out? To explore this question, the graduates and non-graduates were compared with respect to their basic background characteristics listed in Table 1. The resulting distributions are shown in Appendix Table A-1. The most noteworthy feature here is that the graduates compared to the non-graduates include a significantly higher proportion of wards 19 and older; that is, the proportion is greater than would normally be expected to occur merely on the basis of chance. Although not statistically significant, there

is also some tendency for graduates to include a larger proportion of first YA admissions rather than readmissions, as well as a larger percentage of wards without prior records versus with records of confinement prior to YA commitment. Unfortunately, the relative distributions of background characteristics broken down for transfers and escapees include too few cases to permit drawing generalizations.

Academic Performance

Presented in Table 3 are academic performance data for parolees from the program. Included are distributions of students according to college quarters completed, college credits earned, and grade-point average achieved.

During their median stay of 8.8 months at Fricot, the students under consideration attended college for an average (median) of 2.7 quarters, with 44 percent attending at least two quarters. They accumulated an average (median) of 39 units of college credits, ranging from the lowest 25 percent who earned 33 units or less to the top 25 percent who earned more than 52 college units. Their median grade-point average was 3.3 or the equivalent of a "B", with about 46 percent attaining 3.0 or higher, and only 1 percent having less than 2.0 (below "C"). It is noteworthy that four of the students obtained an Associate of Arts degree while involved in the program.

A further analysis was conducted to explore relationships between several basic background characteristics of students and their academic performance, as defined above. The results are summarized in Appendix Table A-2. It was found that students who had no records of local detention before commitment to the Youth Authority, compared to those with prior records, were likely to

TABLE 3

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS PAROLED
FROM FRICOT-COLUMBIA JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAM

Academic Performance	Number	Percent
Total Students Paroled	92*	100.0
College Quarters Completed:		
1	15	16.3
2	25	27.2
3	37	40.2
4	9	9.8
5	4	4.3
6	1	1.1
7	1	1.1
Median	2.7	
Mean	2.7	
College Credits Earned		
Less than 19	5	5.4
20 - 24	10	10.9
25 - 29	10	10.9
30 - 34	4	4.3
35 - 39	19	20.7
40 - 44	10	10.9
45 - 49	6	6.5
50 - 54	8	8.7
55 - 59	5	5.4
60 - 64	5	5.4
65 - 69	2	2.2
70 or more	8	8.7
Median	39.0	
Mean	42.7	
Grade-point Average		
Less than 2.24	3	3.3
2.25 - 2.49	4	4.3
2.50 - 2.74	5	5.4
2.75 - 2.99	14	15.2
3.00 - 3.24	16	17.4
3.25 - 3.49	28	30.5
3.50 - 3.74	18	19.6
3.75 - 3.99	4	4.3
Median	3.3	
Mean	3.2	

*Excludes one ward for whom the information was not available.

complete more college quarters, earn more college credits and attain higher grade-point averages. Similarly, students who were first admissions to the Youth Authority as against readmissions, had a better academic performance based on the aforementioned three criteria. In terms of ethnic background, White students generally revealed a better academic performance than Mexican-American and Black students. Categorized by offense, students committed for offenses against persons performed better academically than did those involved in property offenses, illegal drug usage, and other types of offenses.

The preceding findings should be regarded as being suggestive rather than in any sense conclusive. They were generally not statistically significant, and because of small numbers it was not possible to fully examine the extent to which the characteristics may have been interrelated and resulted in spurious relationships with the criteria of academic performance.[1] Moreover, a precise study would require an experimental design in order to assess the predictiveness of background characteristics relative to academic performance.

Pre-Post Attitudinal Measures

In order to assess student changes in attitudes and on socio-psychological factors, several personality scales were administered upon their admission and prior to their being paroled from the program. Since these scales were not given until July 1970, only 51 students completed both the pre- and post-tests. Five of the scales were selected from Gough's California Personality

---

[1] In a further exploratory analysis, the academic performance of White and Non-White students was found to vary according to their admission status. Thus, better performance among White relative to Non-White students was found for first admissions but not for readmissions in terms of college quarters completed and credits earned.

inventory, while three scales were adapted from Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale, Hunt's Low Self-Esteem Scale, Campbell's Personal Competence Scale, Rundquist and Sletto's Education Scale, and Glassey's Attitudes Toward Education.

As revealed in Table 4, pre- to post-test mean score changes were in a favorable direction on all of the eight scales. However, gains greater than would be expected by chance alone occurred only on the Self-Acceptance, Self-Esteem, and Personal Competence scales. These results generally point to an increased degree of self-assurance and self-worth among students participating in the college program. But because there was no control group, the attitudinal improvement can not be directly attributed to program participation per se.

TABLE 4

PRE- AND POST-TEST MEAN SCORES ON SELECTED SCALES FOR SAMPLE OF PROJECT STUDENTS

Pre- Post Status	Self-Acceptance[1]	Good Impression[1]	Achievement via Conformity[1]	Achievement via Independ.[1]	Intell. Efficiency[1]	Self-Esteem[2]	Personal Competence[3]	Education[4]
Pre-Mean	21.7	16.3	23.3	18.2	36.0	77.9	75.5	79.7
	(3.9)	(6.4)	(6.6)	(4.2)	(6.4)	(10.4)	(9.7)	(10.2)
Post-Mean	23.5	16.4	24.4	19.1	37.0	83.9	80.8	81.6
	(4.1)	(6.3)	(6.1)	(4.2)	(6.3)	(8.7)	(10.2)	(11.9)
Change	1.8*	.1	1.1	.9	1.0	6.0*	5.3*	1.9

Note: Standard deviations are shown in parentheses. Higher scale scores are in favorable direction.

[1]Selected from Gough's California Personality Inventory.

[2]Derived from Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale and Hunt's Low Self-Esteem Scale.

[3]Derived from Campbell's Personal Competence Scale.

[4]Derived from Rundquist and Sletto's Education Scale and Glassey's Attitudes Toward Education Scale.

*Statistically significant at $p < .01$, based on a two-tailed t-test.

To shed light on the relative standing of students upon the five scales taken from the California Personality Inventory (CPI), their mean scores were compared to those obtained for several other groups of male subjects tested on the CPI. The results are set forth in Table 5. The latter normative groups include high school students, college students, young delinquents, and prison inmates. In comparing the mean scores, the project group appears most similar to the sample group of college students on the Self-Acceptance and the two Achievement scales; however, the project group resembles the sample groups of prison inmates and young delinquents on the Good Impression and Intellectual Efficiency scales. The Fricot group's rather high score on Self-Acceptance (both their pre- and post-test means exceeded the mean score of the college student sample) fell within the upper and lower limits of the means (23-24)

TABLE 5

POST-TEST SAMPLE OF PROJECT STUDENTS COMPARED TO NORMATIVE GROUPS ON MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF CALIFORNIA PERSONALITY INVENTORY

CPI Scales	Project Students (N=51)		Normative Groups							
			High School Students (N=3572)		College Students (N=680)		Young Delinquents (N=142)		Prison Inmates (N=194)	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Self Acceptance	23.5	4.1	18.7	4.1	20.6	6.3	18.4	4.0	19.8	3.5
Good Impression	16.4	6.3	15.1	6.2	18.1	6.3	16.1	6.0	16.2	6.6
Achievement via Conf.	25.7	6.1	22.3	5.3	28.6	4.6	21.2	4.9	21.3	6.0
Achievement via Independence	19.1	4.1	14.6	4.1	21.6	4.1	14.2	4.0	14.4	4.1
Intellectual Efficiency	27.0	6.3	33.6	6.3	40.8	5.2	32.3	6.4	33.2	6.7

reported for two additional samples of graduate college students who were tested on the CPI.[2] Thus, it would seem the screening procedures for the Fricot program tended to select students who manifested several psychological orientations similar to those of college student populations at large.

Student Views Regarding Program

In an effort to tap students' reactions to their program experience, an opinion questionnaire was administered to them at the end of their Fricot stay. A total of 55 students completed and returned the questionnaire.

A review of their responses to items dealing with the overall program and those concerning specific components is presented below. Summarized in Table 6 are the structured items for which response could be trichotomized into categories of "very favorable", "favorable", and "unfavorable".

Students' responses to questions regarding overall appraisal of the Fricot program fell predominantly into the "very favorable" category. The item with the highest proportion (98 percent) of "very favorable" responses dealt with the degree to which the program influenced students to continue college: the item having the next highest proportion (82 percent) pertained to their general reaction to the program.

Over 75 percent of the students felt that the program length was adequate to meet their needs, and that the program's daily schedule was as it should be.

---

[2] Harrison G. Gough, Manual for California Psychological Inventory, Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., Palo Alto, California, p. 34.

TABLE 6

SELECTED STUDENT RESPONSES TO PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE
(In Percent, Based on N=55)

Questionnaire Areas and Item	Student Ratings (Added across to 100 percent)			
	Very Favorable	Favorable	Unfavorable	No Rating
Appraisal of Overall Program				
Has program influenced you to continue college?	98.2	--	1.8	--
General reaction to program?	81.8	14.6	3.6	--
Has program helped prepare for future jobs?	54.6	34.5	10.9	--
Has stay here helped you?	50.9	38.2	10.9	--
Have other wards in program helped?	34.5	54.6	10.9	--
Appraisal of Program Components				
Was program schedule right?	81.9	3.6	14.5	--
Was program length right?	78.2	7.3	14.5	--
Does staff really care what happens to you?	60.0	21.8	--	18.2
Does staff understand your problems?	40.0	38.2	21.8	--
Has lodge staff helped you prepare for return to community?	38.2	38.2	23.6	--
Social	63.7 [a]	20.0 [a]	12.7 [a]	3.6 [a]
Furloughs	83.6	7.3	7.3	1.8
Visits	63.6	14.6	9.1	12.7
Off ground social	61.8	18.2	18.2	1.8
Lodge recreation	41.8	40.0	18.2	--
Classes	58.2 [a]	34.6 [a]	3.6 [a]	3.6 [a]
Columbia Junior College	85.5	10.9	--	3.6
Evening	52.7	41.8	--	5.5
Remedial	34.6	49.1	12.7	3.6
Counseling	38.2 [a]	25.5 [a]	34.5 [a]	1.8 [a]
Individual	70.9	21.8	7.3	--
Small Group	41.8	32.7	23.7	1.8
Large Group	3.6	20.0	70.9	5.5
Work Assignment	30.9 [a]	27.3 [a]	18.2 [a]	23.6 [a]
Staff Aide	45.5	10.9	9.1	34.5
Maintenance	30.9	25.5	23.6	20.0
Cullinary	25.5	41.8	29.1	3.6
Laundry	21.8	29.1	10.9	38.2

[a] Mean of subcategory ratings.

There was less concensus, however, with regard to staff. While 60 percent of the respondents strongly indicated ("very favorable") that "staff really cares what happens to You", only 40 percent strongly felt that "staff understands your problems" and 38 percent that "staff helped you to prepare for return to the community." Nevertheless, considering the combined "very favorable" and "favorable" responses, over 75 percent of the students rated staff positively in the aforementioned areas.

Among the other program components, those relating to social aspects (on- and off-grounds recreation, furloughs, and visits) were as a whole rated most favorably (64 percent); somewhat smaller percentages of highly favorable ratings were given to college classes (58 percent), counseling (38 percent), and work assignments (31 percent). Interestingly enough, within these areas the individual items received relatively few (less than 30 percent) "unfavorable" responses, the only exception being large group counseling (71 percent "unfavorable").

Post-Release Performance

To obtain indications of the community adjustment of program graduates, follow-up information was routinely collected with regard to their school attendance and employment record. It was generally expected that as a result of their fairly positive experiences in the Columbia Junior College Program, the wards would tend to continue their college careers upon return to the community. Moreover, it was hypothesized that the program would have a favorable influence on their post-release adjustment in terms of non-violation of parole, as well as employment.

Detailed in Table 7 is the extent to which program graduates attended college or other schools during their first 6 months on parole as well as from their 7th to 12th month of parole. About 61 percent attended college within the first 6 months (48 percent full-time, 13 percent part-time); about 54 percent returned to college or school during 7 to 12 months of time out, (41 percent full-time, 13 percent part-time). It should be noted that for the two follow-up periods 39 percent and 46 percent, respectively, did not attend college or

TABLE 7

COLLEGE AND OTHER SCHOOL ATTENDANCE OF PROGRAM GRADUATES DURING FIRST SIX MONTHS AND SEVEN TO TWELVE MONTHS OF POST-RELEASE TIME

College or Other School Attendance	First 6 Months		7 - 12 Months	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Attended college or school	53	60.8	44	54.3
Attended college full-time	(41)	(47.1)	(32)	(39.5)
Attended other school full-time	(1)	(1.1)	(1)	(1.2)
Attended college part-time	(11)	(12.6)	(8)	(9.9)
Attended other school part-time	-	-	(3)	(3.7)
Did not attend college or school	34	39.2	37	45.7
Total	87	100.0	81	100.0
School status unknown	4		3	
In custody	2		6	
Discharged from YA	-		3	

other schools. As discussed later in conjunction with Table 11, these percentages include large proportions of wards who were employed full-time or part-time.

Further data were gathered with respect to the length of college or other school attendance during the two study period. As seen in Table 8, nearly two thirds of the wards attended four months or longer during the initial six

months on parole, meaning that these youths continued college soon after departure from the Columbia Junior College Program. Table 8 also reveals that three-fourths attended college four months or longer during 7 to 12 months of time on parole.

TABLE 8

PERIOD OF COLLEGE OR OTHER SCHOOL ATTENDANCE DURING FIRST SIX MONTHS AND SEVEN TO TWELVE MONTHS OF POST-RELEASE TIME

Period of College or Other School Attendance	First 6 Months		7 - 12 Months	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under 2 months	8	15.7	2	5.1
2 to under 3 months	4	7.8	3	7.7
3 to under 4 months	6	11.8	5	12.8
4 months or longer	33	64.7	29	74.4
Total Attending	51	100.0	39	100.0
Period of attendance unknown	2		5	

Follow-up data pertaining to the employment records of the subject wards are shown in Table 9. These statistics are limited to wards available for full-time employment; excluded are wards not deemed employable for most of the period covered, that is, those attending school two months or longer and those in lockup facilities two months or longer.[2] The table reveals that about 77 percent of the employable parolees held jobs during the first six months and 80 percent during their 7th to 12th month of time out. Full-time jobs were

[2]Wards who attended school full-time and held full-time jobs were counted as employed full-time.

held by 49 percent within the first six months and by 63 percent during 7 to 12 months of time on parole.

TABLE 9

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF PROGRAM GRADUATES DURING FIRST SIX MONTHS AND SEVEN TO TWELVE MONTHS OF POST-RELEASE TIME

Employment Status	First 6 Months		7 - 12 Months	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Employed full-time	26	49.1	33	63.5
Employed part-time or intermittently	12	22.6	8	15.4
Employed but extent unknown	3	5.7	1	1.9
Not employed	12	22.6	10	19.2
Total employable	53	100.0	52	100.0
Not employable	37		34	
Employment status unknown	3		4	
Discharged from YA	-		3	

As seen in Table 10, over 70 percent of the wards who found full-time jobs during the first six months sustained such employment for at least four months. Thus, among these wards a considerable degree of job stability was apparent within their initial period on parole.

TABLE 10

PERIOD OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT DURING FIRST SIX MONTHS AND SEVEN TO TWELVE MONTHS OF POST-RELEASE TIME

Period of Full-Time Employment	First 6 Months		7 - 12 Months	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under 3 Months	2	8.0	2	6.1
3 to under 4 months	5	20.0	6	18.2
4 months or longer	18	72.0	25	75.7
Total employed full-time	25	100.0	33	100.0
Employment period unknown	1			

Featured in Table 11 are the number and percentages of wards who held jobs and/or were attending school, that is, were engaged in a full-time parole program. Of main interest is the fact that approximately 90 percent of the wards were involved with jobs and/or school during the first six months, while the remaining 10 percent were "at loose ends". In addition, it appears that within the first six months the wards involved in a schedule of jobs and/or school were relatively evenly distributed among the sub-categories "Job and school", "Job, no school", and "School, no job".

TABLE 11

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND JOB STATUS DURING FIRST SIX MONTHS AND SEVEN TO TWELVE MONTHS OF POST-RELEASE TIME

School and Job Status	First 6 Months		7 - 12 Months	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Job and/or school	77	89.5	70	90.9
Job and school	(28)	(32.5)	(28)	(36.3)
Job, no school	(25)	(29.1)	(26)	(33.8)
School, no job	(24)	(27.9)	(16)	(20.8)
No job and no school	9	10.5	7	9.1
Total	86	100.0	77	100.0
School-job status unknown	5		7	
In custody	2		6	
Discharged from YA	-		3	

To examine the parole performance of the program graduates, Table 12 was constructed based on statistics routinely maintained for all wards released to parole. For purposes of this evaluation, parole failure is defined as a parole violation resulting in removal from parole either through revocation or

through discharge from Youth Authority jurisdiction while under suspended parole status. Shown in Table 12 are the percentages of the program graduates who failed after successive periods of time on parole.

TABLE 12

PAROLE VIOLATION STATUS OF PROGRAM GRADUATES, BY POST-RELEASE PERIOD

Post-Release Period	Total Paroled*	Violators	Non-Violators	Percent Violators	Discharged from YA	Deceased
3 Months	91	2	89	2.2	1	1
6 Months	91	3	88	3.3	1	1
9 Months	88	4	84	4.5	4	1
12 Months	85	6	79	7.1	7	1
15 Months	80	7	73	8.8	12	1

*Excluded wards who were discharged from the California Youth Authority and those who were deceased, as shown in the last two columns. During the 15-month follow-up, none of the 12 discharged wards were committed to the California Department of Corrections.

It is apparent that after 15 months of post-release time the failure rate was about nine percent. It should be mentioned that two wards not included in this rate were reported to have spent over three months in jail, even though they were not violated. Counting these wards as additional failures, a total of 9 wards or 11 percent of the 80 graduates recidivated within the 15 months. Since the evaluation does not involve a control group, the observed failure rate may be compared against the statewide violation rate of 28 percent obtained at 15 months of exposure for wards 18-20 years old who were released to parole in 1970. This comparison points up the unusually low failure rate found for the program graduates. This low rate could have resulted from the kinds of (low parole risk) wards who were generally <u>selected</u> for the program and/or the <u>positive impact</u> exerted by the program upon its participants.

CONCLUSIONS

Viewed overall, the above findings suggest that the program as implemented at the Columbia Junior College and at the Fricot School was a viable approach which provided a realistic introduction to college education for a substantial number of older wards. It would appear that the major objectives of the program were largely attained during its two years of operation.

Thus, nearly three-fourths of the students admitted completed the program, indicating that the admission criteria and program procedures were reasonably serviceable. Use of the students in support services appreciably reduced the cost of food services and provided assistance to the maintenance crew at the institution. Moreover, those students who worked as staff aides rendered tutorial, counseling and recreational assistance to younger wards within various living units and classrooms at Fricot. Although there was no control group, it is likely that the program had a rehabilitative influence, as reflected in the predominantly favorable attitudinal changes among students, as well as their generally favorable appraisals of their program experience. The unusually low rate of parole violation observed for the program releases is consistent with this interpretation.

A notable aspect of the program was that virtually all of the students attended junior college full-time in the community prior to parole. This was accomplished without any jeopardy to the college campus or area residents.

From an educational standpoint, the program enabled students to accumulate an average of 39 units during their median stay of 8.8 months at Fricot. According to the full-load schedule of 12 units generally prescribed per semester by

community colleges, the students would have been expected to complete 24 units during 8.8 months; that is, they finished 15 units more than would normally be expected. As regards grade-point achievement, the students revealed a "B" average.

Although inconclusive, the findings indicate that students with certain background characteristics tended to do better academically, in terms of college quarters completed, college credits earned, and grade-point average attained. Generally, better academic performance was noted for: 1) White relative to Non-White students, 2) those without records of local detention prior to Youth Authority commitment as against those with prior records, 3) students who were first admissions rather than readmissions, and 4) students who were committed for offenses against persons compared to those for other offenses.

There is some reason to believe the program was conducive to continuation of college soon after release to parole: 60 percent of those who completed the program went on to attend community colleges within six months after being paroled.

In light of the promising results yielded in this study, it is recommended that assessment of the basic program model, which is currently implemented at the Youth Authority's Ventura School, be pursued so as to permit a more definitive evaluation of impact both during program participation and after release to parole. Since the current evaluation does not provide sufficient evidence as to what types of wards are likely to succeed in the program, future use of similar junior college models should include thorough screening of candidates, with judgements based on intensive casework. To increase the number of parolees who continue on with college, it is recommended that

similar college programs in the Youth Authority be supplemented with a post-release phase in the community, including perhaps a halfway house or residential center. The aim would be to afford less structure than the institution, but sufficient structure to support and motivate parolees to see their program through to completion.

TABLE A-1

SELECTED BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF GRADUATES, TRANSFERS, AND ESCAPES AMONG WARDS ADMITTED INTO FRICOT-COLUMBIA JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAM

Selected Characteristics	Total Subjects		Graduates		Total Non-Graduates		Non-Graduates			
							Transfers		Escapes	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Subjects	127	100.0	93	100.0	34	100.0	24	100.0	10	100.0
Age at admission*										
16 - 17	16	12.6	8	8.6	8	23.5	6	25.0	2	20.0
18	25	19.7	16	17.2	9	26.5	8	33.4	1	10.0
19	41	32.3	36	38.7	5	14.7	3	12.5	2	20.0
20 - 22	45	35.4	33	35.5	12	35.3	7	29.1	5	50.0
Median			19.1		18.5		18.3		19.5	
Mean			19.1		18.7		18.5		18.9	
Ethnic Group										
Caucasian	96	75.6	68	73.1	28	82.4	20	83.4	8	80.0
Mexican-American	12	9.4	9	9.7	3	8.8	2	8.3	1	10.0
Black	16	12.5	14	15.0	2	5.9	2	8.3	--	--
Other	3	2.4	2	2.2	1	2.9	--	--	1	10.0
Prior Incarceration										
None	62	48.8	49	52.7	13	38.3	8	33.4	5	50.0
Prior Incarceration	65	51.2	44	47.3	21	61.7	16	66.6	5	50.0
Admission Status										
First admissions	95	74.8	73	78.5	22	64.7	14	58.3	8	80.0
Readmissions	32	25.2	20	21.5	12	35.3	10	41.7	2	20.0
Court										
Juvenile	30	23.6	18	19.3	12	35.3	9	37.5	3	30.0
Criminal	97	76.4	75	80.7	22	64.7	15	62.5	7	70.0
Offense										
Assaultive	21	16.5	15	16.1	6	17.6	4	16.7	2	20.0
Property offense	41	32.3	28	30.1	13	38.2	11	45.8	2	20.0
Illegal drugs	55	43.3	44	47.3	11	32.4	6	25.0	5	50.0
Other	10	7.9	6	6.5	4	11.8	3	12.5	1	10.0
County of Commitment										
Los Angeles	41	32.3	34	36.5	7	20.6	6	25.0	1	10.0
Other So. Calif. Cos.	25	19.7	13	14.0	12	35.3	6	25.0	6	60.0
Central Valley Cos.	22	17.3	14	15.1	8	23.5	6	25.0	2	20.0
S. F. Bay Area Cos.	27	21.3	22	23.6	5	14.7	5	20.8	--	--
Other Counties	12	9.4	10	10.8	2	5.9	1	4.2	1	10.0

*Chi-square = 6.7, d.f. = 1, significant at .02 level with two-tailed test: Comparison between graduates and non-graduates 16 - 18 versus 19 - 22 years old.

TABLE A-2

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF WARDS WHO COMPLETED FRICOT-COLUMBIA JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAM

(In Percent)

PERFORMANCE DATA	Admission Status		Prior Record			Age		Ethnicity				Offense			
	1st Admission	Readmission	None	Law Enforce. Contacts	Prior Incarc.	18 and Under	Over 18	White	Hex.-Am.	Black	Other	Against Person	Property	Illegal Drugs	Other
Total Subjects	100.0 (72)	100.0 (20)	100.0 (9)	100.0 (40)	100.0 (43)	100.0 (24)	100.0 (68)	100.0 (68)	100.0 (9)	100.0 (13)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (14)	100.0 (26)	100.0 (44)	100.0 (8)
Number of College Quarters Completed															
One Quarter	15.3	20.0	11.1	12.5	20.9	12.5	17.6	14.7	11.2	30.8	-	-	26.9	11.4	37.5
Two Quarters	23.6	40.0	22.2	25.0	30.2	37.5	23.5	26.5	33.3	30.8	-	21.4	26.9	29.5	25.0
Three Quarters	43.0	30.0	66.7	42.5	32.6	41.7	39.8	41.2	33.3	30.8	100.0	57.2	42.4	38.6	12.5
Four or more	18.1	10.0	-	20.0	16.3	8.3	19.1	17.6	22.2	7.6	-	21.4	3.8	20.5	25.0
College Credits Earned															
Less than 30	22.2	45.0	22.2	22.5	32.6	29.2	26.5	26.5	22.2	38.4	-	-	38.5	25.0	50.0
30 - 39	26.4	20.0	22.2	20.0	30.2	25.0	25.0	20.6	44.4	38.4	-	42.8	23.1	22.7	12.5
40 - 54	26.4	25.0	11.1	35.0	20.9	33.3	23.5	25.0	22.2	23.2	100.0	28.6	34.6	22.7	12.5
55 or more	25.0	10.0	44.5	22.5	16.3	12.5	25.0	27.9	11.2	-	-	28.6	3.8	29.6	25.0
Grade-point Average															
Less than 3.00	26.3	35.0	22.2	30.0	27.9	16.7	32.4	26.5	22.2	38.5	50.0	7.1	38.5	27.3	37.5
3.00 - 3.24	15.3	25.0	11.1	15.0	20.9	25.0	14.7	16.2	33.3	7.7	50.0	28.6	15.4	18.2	-
3.25 - 3.49	29.2	35.0	22.2	25.0	37.2	33.3	29.4	30.8	11.2	46.1	-	28.6	26.9	29.5	50.0
3.50 or more	29.2	5.0	44.5	30.0	14.0	25.0	23.5	26.5	33.3	7.7	-	35.7	19.2	25.0	12.5

APPENDIX B

4/20/70

Name _____ Y.A. #_____

Date _____

CJC QUESTIONNAIRE

Unless stated otherwise, check only one statement to each question.

1. How do you feel about being here?

_____Someone who got a raw deal
_____Someone with personal problems
_____Someone who knows what the score is and knows how to play it cool
_____Someone who made a mistake
_____Someone who is trying to straighten out

2. How much has your stay here helped you?

_____A great deal
_____Quite a bit
_____Some but not much
_____Very little
_____None

3. If your stay in the Youth Authority has helped you, is it because:

_____I have learned my lesson
_____I have learned something about myself and why I got into trouble
_____I have been punished for what I did

4. What is your reaction to the Columbia Junior College Program?

_____Much better than I expected
_____Better than I expected
_____About what I expected
_____Worse than I expected
_____Much worse than I expected

5. In what ways has the program helped you?

_____Helped me develop a more positive attitude toward school
_____Helped me develop good study habits
_____Helped me decide what I want to be
_____Helped me to get along with others
_____Increased my self-confidence
_____Impressed upon me the value of education
_____It has not helped me at all

6. If this program has benefited you, what do you attribute it to?

_____My own hard work and effort
_____Opportunity to be on my own and attend school
_____Chance to work with younger wards
_____Guidance and counseling received from Fricot staff
_____Guidance and counseling received from Columbia staff
_____Other (specify)

7. In what way has the program helped you the most?

_____Understand myself
_____Overcome my problems
_____Help me to have better relationships with others
_____Continue my education which I otherwise wouldn't have done
_____Decide on a career
_____Other (specify)

8. What do you like best about attending college while in the Youth Authority?

_____Gives me an opportunity to improve myself
_____Keeps me busy so that time passes fast
_____Gives me a chance to leave the grounds and associate other people
_____Makes me feel responsible and independent
_____Other (specify)

9. How much do you think the Columbia Program helped you to prepare for future jobs?

_____I have received a lot of help
_____I have received some help
_____I have received very little help
_____I have not received any help in preparing for the future

10. In your estimation do you think the Columbia Program was:

_____Too long
_____Too short
_____Just about right

11. How do you feel about your program schedule?

_____I seldom have any free time and I am overprogrammed
_____There is too much free time and I am not programmed enough
_____My schedule is just about right

12. How do you think this program could be changed, expecially for the wards who come here after you leave?

_____More educational and vocational counseling from staff
_____More free time to study
_____More help in dealing with personal problems
_____It is fine the way it is
_____Other (specify)

13. What is your opinion of other wards in the program?

_____Drifted through and just waited to get out
_____Put up a front and pretended the program was helpful
_____Tried to change and help themselves

14. How much do you think other wards in the Columbia Program were helped?

_____Helped a lot
_____Helped some
_____Helped very little
_____Not helped at all

15. In what way do you think the Program will help wards the most after they leave here:

_____Find a job and hold it
_____Continue their education
_____Stay out of trouble with the law
_____Understand themselves and others better
_____Get along better with parents and family

16. How well do you feel staff understands your problems and needs?

_____They usually understand them
_____They sometimes understand them
_____They don't know much about my problems and needs

17. Are staff just doing their job or do they really care what happens to you?

_____Really care
_____Just doing their job
_____Don't know

18. Which staff member has been most helpful?

_____Youth Counselor
_____Senior Youth Counselor
_____Group Supervisor
_____Social Worker
_____Treatment Team Supervisor
_____Other (specify)

19. If you had a problem and wanted to talk about it, who would you go to first?

_____Youth Counselor
_____Social Worker
_____Treatment Team Supervisor
_____Another ward
_____No one

20. Has your lodge staff helped you prepare for your return to the community?

_____Helped a lot
_____Helped some
_____Helped very little
_____No help

21. What job did you perform during your nonschool hours?

_____Food service assistant
_____Staff aide
_____Teaching assistant
_____Maintenance
_____Other (specify)

22. Rate the following phase of the program.

	GOOD	AVERAGE	POOR
CJC Classes			
Fricot-CJC Remedial Classes			
Fricot-CJC Evening Classes			
Large Group Counseling			
Small Group Counseling			
Individual Counseling			
Lodge Recreation			
Off-ground Social Activities			
Furloughs			
Visits			
Work Assignments			
Culinary			
Hydro			
Maintenance			
Staff Aide			

23. How many months have you been at Fricot? _____months

24. How many quarter hours did you complete at Columbia Junior College?

_____hours

25. Check those statements that describe your academic situation.

_____I have difficulty concentrating on my studies
_____I have difficulty keeping up with my assignments
_____I don't get enough help from either my teachers or staff
_____I neglect my schoolwork when my personal problems get me down
_____Distractions such as bull sessions, outside noise, people passing by, etc., interfere with my studying
_____I have difficulty expressing myself in writing
_____My work is critized as being poorly organized
_____I am able to plan my work load and complete my assignments on time
_____My grades are a fairly accurate reflection of my ability

26. What do you think your chances are of staying on parole?

_____Excellent
_____Good
_____About 50-50
_____Not too good
_____Very poor

27. What are your immediate plans upon leaving?

_____Continue my education and obtain a bachelor's degree or higher
_____Graduate from junior college and go to work
_____Go to work as soon as possible
_____Either work or college, depending on how things work out
_____No definite plans

28. What kind of work do you plan to do, either now or when you finish college?

_____

29. Has your academic experience in this program aided in motivating or influencing you to continue your college endeavor?

_____Yes
_____No

Explain: If yes, How? If no, Why?

30. What ideas of criticisms do you have that would aid us in improving the following aspects of this program?

a. Academic

b. Work: (i.e., culinary, maint, laundry, lodge assignments).

c. Group Living

d. Recreation

e. Staff Aid-Teacher Aide

f. Staff Relationships

31. What positive comments can you make about the following aspects of this program?

a. Academic

b. Work (i.e., culinary, maint., laundry, lodge assignments).

c. Group Living

d. Recreation

e. Staff Aid-Teacher Aide

f. Staff Relationships

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
SEP 13 1974
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION